



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,898	11/02/2001	Maurice Haman Abraham	B-4358 619258-8	7200

7590 01/13/2005
c/o LADAS & PARRY
Suite 2100
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,898

Applicant(s)

ABRAHAM ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/12/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 9 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “the processor is arranged to compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the

Art Unit: 2143

drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: The word analyse is misspelled and should be analyze. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2143

7. The limitation of claims 2 and 8 that state, “in response to the analyze, to initiate execution of the associated interactive node such that if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed,” is not specifically found in the main body of the specification nor the drawing to enable one of ordinary skill in the art how “the interactive node is re-executed” in the system. The Applicant is asked to point to specific items in the figures that correspond to section in the main body of the specification that could be interpreted as the claim language states.

8. The limitation of claims 3 and 9 that state, “compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node,” is not specifically found in the main body of the specification nor the drawing to enable one of ordinary skill in the art how “the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node” in the system. The Applicant is asked to point to specific items in the figures that correspond to section in the main body of the specification that could be interpreted as the claim language states.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jawahar et al. U.S. Patent No. 6298356 (hereinafter Jawahar).

11. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches a computer apparatus for implementing a workflow, the workflow being defined by a sequence of activity nodes that include a plurality of interactive nodes, the computer apparatus comprising a processor for arranging and initiating the execution of the activity nodes in accordance with the defined sequence, wherein each interactive node is arranged to allow a user to input data for use in the execution of an activity node, the processor being arranged to analyze the user data to determine the interactive node in the sequence of activity nodes to which the data is associated, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 16, lines 23 – 39).

12. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the processor being arranged, in response to the analyze, to initiate execution of the associated interactive node such that if the user data is associated with an interactive node that has been executed the interactive node is re-executed, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 21, lines 35 – 44).

13. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the processor is arranged to compensate executed activity nodes that follow in the defined sequence from the re-executed interactive node, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, “*back and forward*”).

14. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches a computer system comprising a computer apparatus according to claim 1 coupled, via a network, to a second computer apparatus, the second computer apparatus having a user interface to allow a user to input data for an interactive node, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, “*back and forward*”).

15. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the network is the internet, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28).

16. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Jawahar teaches the user interface is an internet application allowing sequential movement between web pages , (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 28 & col. 14, lines 40 – 55, “*back and forward*”).

17. Claims 7 – 9 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. a. Gutfreund et al. U.S. Patent No. 6192394 discloses Inter-program synchronous communications using a collaboration software system.

Art Unit: 2143

20. b. Pacifici et al. U.S. Patent No. 6230171 discloses Markup system for shared HTML documents.
21. c. Fraenkel et al. U.S. Patent No. 6151622 discloses Method and system for portably enabling view synchronization over the world-wide web using frame hierarchies.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100